



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,617	09/09/2003	Lloyd G. Mitchell	AP35003-A	2539
38485	7590	06/01/2005	EXAMINER	
ARENT FOX PLLC 1675 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10019			GUZO, DAVID	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1636	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,617

Applicant(s)

MITCHELL ET AL.

Examiner

David Guzo

Art Unit

1636

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 19-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . |

Detailed Action

Sequence Rules

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth below or on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Specifically, nucleotide sequences are present in Figures 3, 7, 10, 15 and 25B; however, no Sequence Listing is present in the file. Applicants are encouraged to review the entire application for compliance with the sequence rules.

Applicant must comply with the sequence rules, 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached Notice to Comply with the reply. The nature of the non-compliance has however not precluded an examination of the application on the merits, the results of which are communicated below.

Priority

It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. 10/374,784 and 60/359,948, filed 2/25/03 and 2/25/02, respectively. A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e)

or 120. See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications. Also, the current status of all nonprovisional parent applications referenced should be included.

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3)

Art Unit: 1636

a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

In the instant case, applicants have claimed priority for the 10/374,784 and 60/359,948 applications in the Declaration and Transmittal papers; therefore a petition is not required. Applicants must however make the priority claim on the first page of the specification or in an application data sheet.

Obviousness Type Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-12 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7, 11-13, 16-17, 27, 29-33 of copending Application No. 10/374,784 (hereafter the '784 application).

Art Unit: 1636

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims recite the same cells comprising nucleic acid constructs comprising target binding domains that target binding of a nucleic acid molecule to a target pre-mRNA expressed within the cell, a 3' or 5' splice region comprising a 3' or 5' splice acceptor site, a branch point and pyrimidine tract, a 5' donor site, a spacer region that separates the 3' or 5' splice regions from the target binding domain and a nucleotide sequence encoding a light producing protein or enzyme to be trans-spliced to the target pre-mRNA; wherein the nucleic acid molecule is recognized by nuclear splicing components within the cell. The instant claims are generic in that they recite that the sequence to be trans-spliced to the target pre-mRNA encodes a light producing protein or enzyme while the claims in the '784 application recite a sequence to be trans-spliced which encodes a molecule which provides a fluorescent or bioluminescent signal. Since a molecule which produces a fluorescent or bioluminescent signal is a light producing protein or enzyme, it must be considered that the claims in the '784 application fall entirely within the scope of the instant claims, in other words the cells of the '784 application would anticipate the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 19-26 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11, 25-32, 46-55, 84-93 of copending Application No. 10/434,727 (hereafter the '727 application).

Art Unit: 1636

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each set of claims recite the same recombinant conditionally replicative adenovirus vectors comprising target binding domains that target binding of a nucleic acid molecule to a target pre-mRNA expressed within the cell, a 3' or 5' splice region comprising a 3' or 5' splice acceptor site, a branch point and pyrimidine tract, a 5' donor site, a spacer region that separates the 3' or 5' splice regions from the target binding domain and a nucleotide sequence encoding a light producing protein or enzyme to be trans-spliced to the target pre-mRNA; wherein the nucleic acid molecule is recognized by nuclear splicing components within the cell. The instant claims are generic in that they recite that the sequence to be trans-spliced to the target pre-mRNA encodes an adenoviral protein and/or a polypeptide which function as a light inducing enzyme or protein while the claims in the '727 application recite that the adenoviral protein be a protein essential for adenovirus replication. It must therefore be considered that the claims in the '727 application fall entirely within the scope of the instant claims, in other words the cells of the '727 application would anticipate the instant claims.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-12 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-7, 11-13, 16-17, 27, 29-33 of commonly assigned 10/374,784. Specifically, the claims are not patentably distinct for the reasons cited in the above obviousness type double patenting rejection.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned 10/374,784, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

Claims 19-26 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claims 1-11, 25-32, 46-55, 84-93 of commonly assigned 10/434,727. Specifically, the claims are not patentably distinct for the reasons cited in the above obviousness type double patenting rejection.

The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office normally will not institute an interference between applications or a patent and an application of common ownership (see MPEP § 2302). Commonly assigned 10/434/727, discussed above, would form the basis for a

Art Unit: 1636

rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee can, under 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and 37 CFR 1.78(c), either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made, or name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g), or 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for applications filed on or after November 29, 1999.

It is noted that no assignment data for application 10/374,784 is available to the examiner at this time. However, the examiner assumes that the instant application and the 10/374,784 application are currently commonly owned. If this is not the case, applicants are required to inform the examiner of the current assignment information.

35 USC 102 Rejections

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

Art Unit: 1636

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Otto (2004/0038403, application Serial Number 10/434,727).

The applied reference has a common inventor (and assignee) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Otto would anticipate the claimed invention for the reasons outlined in the above obviousness type double patenting rejection. The instant claims recite subject matter which is generic to what is claimed in the 2004/0038403 publication. It is noted that applicants' first disclosure of the claimed subject matter occurs in the instant application (10/658,617, filed 9/9/03) and hence the 2004/0038403 publication (filing date 5/8/03) represents prior art under 35 USC 102(e).

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mitchell et al. (2004/0058344, Serial Number 10/374,784).

The applied reference has a common inventor (and assignee) with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it

constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Mitchell et al. would anticipate the claimed invention for the reasons outlined in the above obviousness type double patenting rejection. The instant claims recite subject matter which is generic to what is claimed in the 2004/0058344 publication. It is noted that applicants' first disclosure of the instantly claimed subject matter (i.e. any light producing protein or polypeptide, etc.) occurs in the instant application (10/658,617, filed 9/9/03) and hence the 2004/0058344 publication (filing date 2/25/03) represents prior art under 35 USC 102(e).

35 USC 112, 2nd Paragraph

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 27 is vague in that there is no antecedent basis for the term "the conditionally replicative adenovirus".

Claims 13-18 and 27 are free of the art. The prior art does not teach a method for targeting cell death comprising contacting the target cells with a nucleic acid molecule comprising a target binding domain that targets binding of the nucleic acid to a target pre-mRNA expressed within the cell wherein the sequence encodes a light producing protein or enzyme to be trans-spliced to the target pre-mRNA and subsequently exposing the cell to a photosensitizer which is activated by the light produced by the trans-spliced sequence so as to kill the target cell. With regard to claims 1-12, said claims are also free of the art, close prior art is represented by Puttaraju et al., Nature Biotechnology, 1999, Vol. 17, pp. 246-252 and Liu et al., Nature Biotechnology, 2002, Vol. 20, pp. 47-52.


Claims 13-18 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Guzo, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0767. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D., can be reached on (571) 272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Guzo
May 17, 2005


DAVID GUZO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of Attachment(s) 6). Other: Notice to Comply with Sequence Rules.

Notice to Comply	Application No. 10/658,617	Applicant(s) Mitchell et al.	
	Examiner David Guzo	Art Unit 1636	

NOTICE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS FOR PATENT APPLICATIONS CONTAINING NUCLEOTIDE SEQUENCE AND/OR AMINO ACID SEQUENCE DISCLOSURES

Applicant must file the items indicated below within the time period set in the Office action to which the Notice is attached to avoid abandonment under 35 U.S.C. § 133 (extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a)).

The nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosure contained in this application does not comply with the requirements for such a disclosure as set forth in 37 C.F.R. 1.821 - 1.825 for the following reason(s):

- ☒ 1. This application clearly fails to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.821-1.825. Applicant's attention is directed to the final rulemaking notice published at 55 FR 18230 (May 1, 1990), and 1114 OG 29 (May 15, 1990). If the effective filing date is on or after July 1, 1998, see the final rulemaking notice published at 63 FR 29620 (June 1, 1998) and 1211 OG 82 (June 23, 1998).
- ☒ 2. This application does not contain, as a separate part of the disclosure on paper copy, a "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(c).
- ☒ 3. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has not been submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 4. A copy of the "Sequence Listing" in computer readable form has been submitted. However, the content of the computer readable form does not comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.822 and/or 1.823, as indicated on the attached copy of the marked -up "Raw Sequence Listing."
- ☐ 5. The computer readable form that has been filed with this application has been found to be damaged and/or unreadable as indicated on the attached CRF Diskette Problem Report. A Substitute computer readable form must be submitted as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.825(d).
- ☐ 6. The paper copy of the "Sequence Listing" is not the same as the computer readable form of the "Sequence Listing" as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e).
- ☐ 7. Other: Amino acid sequences listed in claims 27-28 should be identified by a sequence identifier.

Applicant Must Provide:

- ☒ An initial or substitute computer readable form (CRF) copy of the "Sequence Listing".
- ☒ An initial or substitute paper copy of the "Sequence Listing", **as well as an amendment specifically directing its entry into the application.**
- ☒ A statement that the content of the paper and computer readable copies are the same and, where applicable, include no new matter, as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.821(e) or 1.821(f) or 1.821(g) or 1.825(b) or 1.825(d).

For questions regarding compliance to these requirements, please contact:

For Rules Interpretation, call (571) 272-2510

For CRF Submission Help, call (571) 272-2501/2583.

PatentIn Software Program Support

Technical Assistance.....703-287-0200

To Purchase PatentIn Software.....703-306-2600

PLEASE RETURN A COPY OF THIS NOTICE WITH YOUR REPLY